

REMARKS

The Applicants respectfully request further examination and consideration in view of the arguments set forth fully below. Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-39 were previously pending in this application. Within the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-39 have been rejected. By the above amendment, Claims 1, 19 and 29 have been amended. Accordingly, Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-39 are currently pending.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C § 102

Within the Office Action, Claims 1, 3-5 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,141,355 to Palmer et al. ("Palmer"). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. Palmer teaches a network system for providing transmission of real-time data and non-real-time data between a plurality of network devices. Palmer also teaches synchronizing devices to a periodic time frame with two time intervals defined within each repeating frame period. During the first time interval, only isochronous traffic is transmitted, and during the second time interval, the devices function using only standard Ethernet. [Palmer, col. 4, lines 55-67] However, Palmer does not teach that either time interval has priority over the other.

In contrast to the teachings of Palmer, the combined IEEE 1394-2000 and ethernet network of the present invention allows devices on the network to operate according to both the IEEE 1394-2000 protocol and the ethernet protocol. The devices within the network are able to send IEEE 1394-2000 isochronous data, IEEE 1394-2000 asynchronous data and ethernet data. Both IEEE 1394-2000 and ethernet devices within the network are coupled to modified hubs (MHubs) to form a local cluster. The MHubs are coupled to an ethernet switch which controls communications between devices in different local clusters. The ethernet switch and the MHubs obey an isochronous interval in which all isochronous data transfers will be allowed. Preferably, on a regular and reoccurring period, the ethernet switch sends an isotick signal to begin the isochronous interval. Alternatively, clocks at all nodes within the network are synchronized to start and stop the isochronous interval at the same time without the need for any one device to transmit the isotick signal. Any bandwidth left after the isochronous interval is then allocated to the traditional ethernet traffic and the IEEE 1394-2000 asynchronous traffic, until the start of the

next isochronous interval. As described above, Palmer does not teach that the first protocol has priority over the second protocol.

The independent Claim 1 is directed to a method of transmitting data within a network including one or more of a first type of device operating according to a first protocol and a second protocol and one or more of a second type of device operating according to only the second protocol, wherein devices of the first type and devices of the second type communicate with each other within the network. The method of Claim 1 comprises establishing a periodic cycle including a first portion and a second portion, allowing only transmissions according to the first protocol during the first portion and allowing only transmissions according to the second protocol during the second portion, wherein the first protocol has priority over the second protocol. As described above and recognized within the Office Action, Palmer does not teach that the first protocol has priority over the second protocol. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Palmer.

Claims 3-5 and 7 are dependent on the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Palmer. Accordingly, the Claims 3-5 and 7 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C § 103

Within the Office Action, Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,178 to Lo et al. ("Lo"). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 6 is dependent on the independent Claim 1. As discussed above, the independent Claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Palmer. Accordingly, the Claim 6 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 8 and 10-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,747,979 to Banks et al. ("Banks") in view of Palmer and U.S. Patent No. 6,032,211 to Hewitt ("Hewitt"). The Applicants respectfully disagree. Banks teaches a method and apparatus for bridging between networks. As recognized within the Office Action, Banks does not teach a bridge or hub that is connected to and communicating with a switch device. Palmer teaches a network system for providing transmission of real-time data and non-real-time data between a plurality of network devices.

Hewitt teaches a method of mode control in a bus optimized for personal computer data traffic. Hewitt focuses solely on a bus within a personal computer and teaches nothing regarding

networking or a network of devices. Accordingly, neither Banks, Palmer, Hewitt nor their combination teach a third interface configured for coupling to and communicating with the switching device, wherein the switching device sends a periodic signal which signals the start of a period having a first portion and a second portion, wherein only communications in the first protocol are allowed during the first portion and only communications in the second protocol are allowed during the second portion.

Furthermore, there is no motivation to warrant the combination of Banks, Palmer and Hewitt. There is no hint, teaching or suggestion in either of Banks, Palmer and Hewitt to warrant their combination.

This is a classic case of impermissibly using hindsight to make a rejection based on obviousness. The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has stated that “it is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or ‘template’ to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious.” In Re Fritch, 972 F.2d, 1260, 1266, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1784 (Fed. Cir. 1992). As recognized within the Office Action, Banks does not teach a bridge that is directly connected to an communicating with a switch device that sends a period signal, which starts the start of a period having a first portion and a second portion. It is also recognized within the Office Action that Banks does not teach a transmission scheme where periodic signals are sent to signal the start of a period having a first portion and a second portion, wherein only communications in the first protocol are allowed during the first portion and only communications in the second protocol are allowed during the second portion. Palmer teaches a network system for providing transmission of real-time data and non-real-time data between a plurality of network devices. Hewitt teaches a method of mode control in a bus optimized for personal computer data traffic. Within the Office Action, it is stated that

[i]t would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Banks’ bridge to incorporate a transmission scheme to handle asynchronous and isochronous traffic. The motivation being given that asynchronous and isochronous traffics are the main type of traffics handled in home and small office networks having such a transmission scheme allows different devices to communicate in these types of networks efficiently with high QoS [Office Action, pages 7-8]

It is only with the benefit of the present claims, as a “template” that there is any motivation to combine the method of mode control in a bus optimized for personal computer data traffic of Hewitt with the network system of Palmer and the network bridging apparatus of Banks. No

such motivation can be found in the teachings of any of the references. To conclude that the combination of Banks, Palmer and Hewitt is obvious, based on the teachings of these references, is to use hindsight based on the teachings of the present invention and to read much more into Banks, Palmer and Hewitt than their actual teachings. This is simply not permissible based on the directive from the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

It is well settled that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met:

- 1) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings;
- 2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and
- 3) the prior art reference, or references, must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2143.

The burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on the teachings of Banks, Palmer and Hewitt has not been met within the Office Action.

There is no motivation to combine the teachings of Hewitt with Banks and Palmer. Hewitt relates to a bus optimized for data traffic within a personal computer. Hewitt has nothing to do with networking. There is no hint, teaching or suggestion in either Banks, Palmer or Hewitt to motivate one skilled in the art to combine their teachings. It is only with the benefit of the presently claimed invention as a “template” that one would consider combining a bus optimized for personal computer data traffic with the networking system of Palmer and the network apparatus of Banks.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Response to Arguments which states that, “Hewitt is very relevant because it is introduced to teach different transmission modes on a bus and the fact that a PC uses the bus even makes it more relevant.” [Office Action, page 19] As described above, Hewitt is focused on transferring data over a bus between two components within a personal computer. Hewitt never discusses anything related to networking, and specifically, never teaches anything regarding a combined network that allows devices on the network to operate according to multiple protocols. Therefore, Hewitt should not be utilized as prior art and clearly should not be combined with Banks and Palmer.

In contrast to the teachings of Banks, Palmer, Hewitt and their combination, the combined IEEE 1394-2000 and ethernet network of the present invention allows devices on the network to operate according to both the IEEE 1394-2000 protocol and the ethernet protocol.

The devices within the network are able to send IEEE 1394-2000 isochronous data, IEEE 1394-2000 asynchronous data and ethernet data. Both IEEE 1394-2000 and ethernet devices within the network are coupled to modified hubs (MHubs) to form a local cluster. The MHubs are coupled to an ethernet switch which controls communications between devices in different local clusters. The ethernet switch and the MHubs obey an isochronous interval in which all isochronous data transfers will be allowed. Preferably, on a regular and reoccurring period, the ethernet switch sends an isotick signal to begin the isochronous interval. Any bandwidth left after the isochronous interval is then allocated to the traditional ethernet traffic and the IEEE 1394-2000 asynchronous traffic, until the start of the next isochronous interval. As described above, neither Banks, Palmer, Hewitt, nor their combination teach a third interface configured for coupling to and communicating with the switching device, wherein the switching device sends a periodic signal which signals the start of a period having a first portion and a second portion, wherein only communications in the first protocol are allowed during the first portion and only communications in the second protocol are allowed during the second portion.

The independent Claim 8 is directed to a modified hub device configured for coupling between two or more devices operating according to two or more different protocols and a switching device, wherein devices of the first type and devices of the second type communicate with each other. The hub device of Claim 8 comprises a first interface configured for coupling to and communicating with one or more of a first type of device operating according to a first protocol and a second protocol, a second interface configured for coupling to and communicating with one or more of a second type of device operating according to only the second protocol and a third interface configured for coupling to and communicating with the switching device, wherein the switching device sends a periodic signal which signals the start of a period having a first portion and a second portion, wherein only communications in the first protocol are allowed during the first portion and only communications in the second protocol are allowed during the second portion. As described above, the combination of Banks, Palmer and Hewitt is improper. Even if considered proper neither Banks, Palmer, Hewitt, nor their combination teach a third interface configured for coupling to and communicating with the switching device, wherein the switching device sends a periodic signal which signals the start of a period having a first portion and a second portion, wherein only communications in the first protocol are allowed during the first portion and only communications in the second protocol are allowed during the second portion. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 8 is allowable over the teachings of Banks, Palmer, Hewitt and their combination.

Claims 10-17 are dependent on the independent Claim 8. As discussed above, the independent Claim 8 is allowable over the teachings of Banks, Palmer, Hewitt and their combination. Accordingly, the Claims 10-17 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Banks in view of Palmer and Hewitt and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,772,267 to Thaler et al. (“Thaler”). Claim 18 is dependent on the independent Claim 8. As discussed above, the independent Claim 8 is allowable over the teachings of Banks, Palmer, Hewitt and their combination. Accordingly, the Claim 18 is also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 19-25 and 29-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer in view of Banks. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. By the above amendments, Claims 19 and 29 each have the limitation, “wherein the first protocol has priority over the second protocol.” As described above, Palmer does not teach this limitation. Furthermore, Banks also does not teach this limitation. Accordingly, neither Palmer, Banks nor their combination teach that the first protocol has priority over the second protocol.

The independent Claim 19 is directed to a switching device configured for coupling to two or more hub devices providing interfaces to one or more of a first type of device operating according to a first protocol and a second protocol and one or more of a second type of device operating according to only the second protocol. The switching device of Claim 19 comprises a plurality of ports, each port coupled to a corresponding hub device for interfacing with devices coupled to the corresponding hub device and a control circuit coupled to the plurality of ports for sending a periodic signal which signals the start of a period having a first portion and a second portion, wherein only communications in the first protocol are allowed during the first portion and only communications in the second protocol are allowed during the second portion, wherein the first protocol has priority over the second protocol. As described above, neither Palmer, Banks nor their combination teach that the first protocol has priority over the second protocol. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 19 is allowable over the teachings of Palmer, Banks and their combination.

Claims 20-25 are dependent on the independent Claim 19. As discussed above, the independent Claim 19 is allowable over the teachings of Palmer, Banks and their combination.

Accordingly, the Claims 20-25 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

The independent Claim 29 is directed to a network of devices comprising a switching device and a plurality of modified hub devices. The switching device of Claim 29 includes a plurality of ports and a control circuit coupled to the plurality of ports for sending a periodic signal which signals the start of a period having a first portion and a second portion, wherein only communications in a first protocol are allowed during the first portion and only communications in a second protocol are allowed during the second portion. The plurality of modified hub devices of Claim 29 each include a first interface configured for coupling to and communicating with one or more of a first type of device operating according to the first protocol and the second protocol, a second interface configured for coupling to and communicating with one or more of a second type of device operating according to only the second protocol wherein the first protocol has priority over the second protocol and a third interface coupled to a corresponding one of the plurality of ports. As described above, neither Palmer, Banks nor their combination teach that the first protocol has priority over the second protocol. For at least these reasons, the independent Claim 29 is allowable over the teachings of Palmer, Banks and their combination.

Claims 30-36 are dependent on the independent Claim 29. As discussed above, the independent Claim 29 is allowable over the teachings of Palmer, Banks and their combination. Accordingly, the Claims 30-36 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 26, 27, 37 and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer in view of Banks and further in view of Hewitt. Claims 26 and 27 are dependent on the independent Claim 19. Claims 37 and 38 are dependent on the independent Claim 29. As discussed above, the independent Claims 19 and 29 are both allowable over the teachings of Palmer, Banks and their combination. Accordingly, the Claims 26, 27, 37 and 38 are all also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Within the Office Action, Claims 28 and 39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer in view of Banks and further in view of Thaler. Claim 28 is dependent on the independent Claim 19. Claim 39 is dependent on the independent Claim 29. As discussed above, the independent Claims 19 and 29 are both allowable over the teachings of Palmer, Banks and their combination. Accordingly, the Claims 28 and 39 are both also allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: SONY-16500

For the reasons given above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be greatly appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, he is encouraged to call the undersigned at (408) 530-9700 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP

Dated: November 15, 2006

By: Jonathan O. Owens
Jonathan O. Owens
Reg. No. 37,902
Attorneys for Applicants

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR § 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP.

Date: 11/15/06 [Signature]